

Intelligence 3a

IC-75-0925

15 April 1975

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Pilot Study Steering Group Meeting, 7 April 1975

1. The Steering Group for the Pilot Study on National Intelligence Support to Field Commanders met in the IC Staff Conference room at 1030, 7 April 1975. Attendees were:

STAT [] USAF, IC Staff, Study Group Co-Chairman;
STAT RAdm Robert P. Hilton, USN, Joint Staff, Co-Chairman;
STAT [] USN, IC Staff, National Working Group
STAT Chairman;
STAT [] DIA, Theater Working Group Chairman;
STAT Capt. Gerald W. Dyer, USN, Joint Staff Executive Officer; and
STAT [] IC Staff Executive Officer.

2. The topics for discussion were:

- a. Working group progress;
- b. The schedule for completing the study; and
- c. The meeting of the Study Group tentatively scheduled for 16 April 1975.

STAT 3. [] discussed Theater Working Group progress.

a. He distributed an outline for his Working Group's report. His Working Group is now assessing the capabilities of each theater asset against theater EEI and putting the data into a computer. The assessments are made by a modified delphi technique, drawing on the experience and judgment of people with expert knowledge of the assets. The basic data will be displayed in 82 matrices, each showing the capability of all theater assets against a single EEI.

b. Answering a question from [] distributed a working paper listing the assumptions his Working Group had made so far regarding asset capabilities. He said that using these assumptions, experts, not members of his Working Group, would judge the capability of each asset against each EEI and assign confidence factors. He said that his Working Group wasn't developing specific criteria to support these assessments, nor were the criteria used by the experts recorded by the Working Group.

STAT

c. [] said he was concerned that the judgmental process could not be traced. Only the experts who make the assessments will know how they were made. This understanding will be lost when they are reassigned. The criteria and assumptions on which confidence factor assessments are made should be stated in detail in the Working Group report. [] said that specific asset capabilities weren't listed anywhere; that this was in keeping with the decision of the Operations Deputies regarding the visibility to be given to theater assets.

STAT

d. Responding to a question, [] described how the National Working Group was developing explicit criteria and stating capabilities to support its confidence factor judgments. The co-chairmen agreed that these procedures would ensure the ability to trace the process on which judgments regarding national capabilities were made. The co-chairmen agreed that parallel visibility for theater capabilities was needed, even though they might be aggregated at brigade, wing and task group levels.

STAT

e. Admiral Hilton reminded [] that the Operations Deputies had agreed to list specific capabilities and that this could be done without an inventory of assets below the agreed levels. He said that capabilities have to be stated in enough detail to permit the reader of the report to understand how the judgments were made.

STAT

f. The co-chairmen said that capabilities could be stated in terms such as number of sorties, frames of film, number of hours that specific kinds of COMINT could be copied, and in what languages, and frequency ranges. Admiral Hilton pointed out that the Operations Deputies were concerned about making resources, such as numbers of people, visible; that they did not want combat units to be identified

as intelligence assets. The co-chairmen agreed, and emphasized, that the Working Groups need to identify capabilities in detail; that resources information, such as manpower and dollar levels and specific equipment types, were not needed for the Pilot Study.

STAT
STAT
STAT
STAT
4. [] asked how the Working Groups were using computer support. [] said that all Theater Working Group assessments were going into the computer to make it easier to manipulate and display the large quantity of data. He said that the data would also be available for manual comparison. [] said that at that time he believed his Working Group would be able to handle its data manually. He is providing the data to R&A Branch, IC Staff, for future use.

STAT
5. [] distributed a working diagram showing the schedule for completing the pilot study. He asked whether the Working Groups would have the basic data for their preliminary reports for the meeting of the Study Group on 16 April. [] said that he would not have a meaningful draft until the end of April. The co-chairmen agreed that the Study Group members should have enough time with the preliminary reports to influence the final working group reports. They agreed to slip the schedule by about two weeks except for the final submission date. STAT

6. The co-chairmen agreed that the Steering Group would meet next during the week of 21 April to again assess progress and review the schedule. The Study Group meeting was slipped to early May.

Gerald W. Dyer

Gerald W. Dyer

Capt., USN



IC Staff

Attachments:
As stated

25X1

Approved For Release 2006/03/17 : CIA-RDP80M01133A000500010028-3

Approved For Release 2006/03/17 : CIA-RDP80M01133A000500010028-3